

# The Classical Bulletin

Vol. III

DECEMBER, 1926

No. 2

## Greek Literature in English

Some interesting opinions with regard to the study of Greek literature in English have lately been expressed in England. "It is surely better," says R. E. M. Davidson in the *Times*, "that young people should read Greek in terse and stately English than not at all. The Authorized Version of the New Testament is incontrovertible proof that a knowledge of the original tongue is not the only key to the treasure-house of a literary masterpiece." "Plato, no doubt, is unique," says G. F. Bridge, "and it is good for us all to read some Plato, but Jowett has made him an English classic, and any one who is not a really good Greek scholar will find it most profitable to read the translation." Mr. Nowell Smith, headmaster of Sherborne (public) School, takes exception to the statement made by R. E. M. Davidson, that "since the bursting of the dykes of compulsory Greek at the universities, Hellenic studies at the public schools have been almost submerged by the flood of modern studies." "At Sherborne," he says *inter alia*, "we have rather more than 25 per cent of the boys studying Greek, and another 25 per cent studying what I call 'Hellenies,' i. e. Greek writers in English translations and Hellenic subjects generally. . . . After 30 years of a teaching career which draws towards its inevitable close, I am thankful to think that Hellenic studies in general, and the study of Greek in particular, meet with far less violent opposition than they did when I began. The close observation of 17 years as a headmaster convinces me that there is no subject nearly so valuable as Greek for combining the educational benefits of intellectual discipline and spiritual enrichment. A great deal of the 'flood of modern subjects' flows over and round our youth with very little effect; but Greek, owing partly to the effort required to master it, partly to the vitality inherent in the language, has a power of penetrating and influencing the spiritual life of intelligent boys to a higher degree than any other subject. The chief enemy of Greek, as of all liberal studies, is blind materialism."

As for boys of talent who are not now studying Greek in our own high schools, or who enter our colleges without Greek, could we not confer a great benefit upon them by offering, in both high school and college, a Greek literature course in English? How much better for them to know Homer, Plato, Thucydides, Demosthenes, and Attic Tragedy through the medium of such excellent translations as those of Jowett, Murray, Way, Jebb, etc., than not to know these world classics at all!

F. A. P.

## Latin Generic and Specific Terms Interchanged

In two papers of last year's CLASSICAL BULLETIN it was pointed out that, since Latin and English do not exactly tally in their number of terms ready to express specific ideas, recourse must be had by the writer to such general terms as, with a hint from the context, will be able to supply the deficiency. The principle involved in this process of interchanging specific for general terms is of no slight value in the classroom and, it is hoped, a brief list of illustrations may be of interest to the reader.

"Disobedience," or "insubordination," or "lack of discipline in the army," is a specific offence for which Latin has not developed a specific term. If we analyze the concept, we get the *genus* of "stepping beyond the proper bounds," or "a lack of restraint," or "undue licence," modified by the *differentia specifica* "on the part of the soldier." Now, the Context supplies the latter, while *immodestia* (in + modus) and *incontinentia* (in -+ continere) will do for the former. Nepos *Lys.* 1, 2: "non virtute sui exercitus, sed *immodestia* factum est adversariorum": "thanks, not to any personal courage of his own troops, but to *lack of discipline* on the part of his opponents." *Alcib.* 8, 5: "perieulum est, ne *immodestia* militum vestrorum occasio detur Lysandro vestri opprimendi exercitus": "there is danger lest the *insubordination* of your soldiers give Lysander a chance to annihilate your army." On the same principle, the specific *subordination* or *discipline* may be expressed by the generic *modestia* ("a keeping within bound") or *continentia*, when the context makes the application clear. Caesar *BG* 7, 52, 4: "se ab milite *modestiam* et *continentiam* desiderare": "he said he required from the rank and file *discipline* and *subordination*."

The specific, "contentment with one's disagreeable lot in life," is to the Roman only a special variety of the general, "equanimity," or "even temper," or "calmness of mind." Hence, "it is their aim to keep the masses in contentment," is expressed thus by Caesar (6, 22, 4): "ut animi aequitate plebem contineant." Aided by the Context, the *genus* "equanimity" stands for the species "equanimity in straitened circumstances" = contentment.

When your friend is in mourning and you sympathize with him, you actually participate in his trouble, you share in his grief. Hence the generic *dolor* may do duty for the specific "sympathy," as in Cicero *Att.* 3, 11, 2: "ut ego tuum amorem et *dolorem* desidero": "how I yearn for your love and sympathy."

A very familiar instance of this idiom is the generic term "desiderium" (= "regret; longing for something absent") in the sense of "homesickness" which is nothing else than a "pining for one's country or home." Hence Cicero's (*fam.* 2, 11, 1) "desiderium urbis" is our *homesickness*. He was in that state "pining for Rome." Again, *fam.* 4, 9, 4: "sapientis est carere patria, duri non desiderare": "it is the part of a wise man to go into exile, but it shows callousness not to be subject to *homesickness*." Livy 21, 21 has: "desiderantibus suis": "even then the soldiers *were homesick*" (though "desiderium" in the same clause is rather the absence from home that causes such feeling; Westcott).

The specific "recovery from sickness," or "convalescence," may be looked upon as a "state of health in the making"; hence, with the aid of the Context, we understand Cicero's warning to Tiro (*fam.* 16, 12, 5): "quae cave ne te perturbent et impediunt *valetudinem tuam*": "don't let these things worry you and so interfere with your *recovery*."

Our English "faith" or "belief" is capable in different contexts of a variety of definitions. If it is nothing more to the writer than an "idea or concept of the existence of a divine Being," it may be given by *opinio*, as in Cie. *Tusc.* 1, 13, 30: "nulla gens tam fera, cuius mentem non imbuerit deorum *opinio*": "no tribe so savage but has a *belief* in gods."

What is a "curse," or "imprecation," if not a "prayer for evil things," or "a calling down of evil by means of prayer"? Hence, if the specific nature of the things called down on a person is clear from the situation, the Latin may be satisfied with the generic "precess," as in Caesar *BG* 6, 31, 5: "omnibus *precibus* detestatus Ambiorigem": "he called down on Ambiorix all manner of *curses*" (Kelsey).

The "reges Syriæ" in Cicero *Verr.* 4, 27, 61 are "the princes of Syria." While there the meaning of the general, "reges," is made clear by the addition of "regis Antiochi filii pueri," "rex" is used, without any qualification, in the sense of "prince" in *Cato Maior* 59: "Cyrus minor, Persarum rex": "Cyrus the Younger, prince of the Persians," or "the Persian Prince." Livy uses "regulus" to express the same idea, as in: "regulus Carthaginiensque dimissi" (42, 24, 10): "the prince (*sc.* Gulussa, Masinissa's son) . . ." In the same way "regina" is our "princess" in *Curtius* 3, 11, 25 and in Vergil, *Aeneid* 6, 28:

magnum *reginae* sed enim miseratus amorem:  
"but lo! pitying the *princess'* great love."

The generic term "miles," "soldier," including high and low, very frequently refers to the "common or private soldier," in contrast to the officer; hence the plural "milites" will often do for our "the rank and file." So Cicero in the *Somnium Scipionis*: "ad quam tu oppugnandum nunc venis paene miles": "little more than a common soldier, you now come to lay siege to it."

An "insanus" is "a madman," "one out of his mind"; the specific color attaching to the word is gathered from the context. In *Att.* 4, 6, 2 Cicero writes:

"si loquor de re publica, quod oportet, *insanus*, si, quod opus est, *servus* existimor": "if I discuss politics as my conscience dictates, I pass for a *Utopian*, if as circumstances may demand, for a *trimmer*." The general, "madman," under stress of the Context, becomes a "political madman," an idea for which we too have a whole string of (more or less uncomplimentary) general expressions, as "enthusiast, dreamer, visionary, utopian, fanatic, phantast, illusionist." Within the same context it is tempting to see in the general "*servus*," (slave), a modern "time-server" or "trimmer." It is possible, however, that nothing more is hinted at than the mean, groveling spirit of an out-and-out politician, who keeps his ear to the ground, instead of rising freely and independently above personal interest.

Lastly, the "artificia" which Caesar mentions (*Civil War* I 58) in the description of the sea-fight at Marseilles, are "*nautical* tricks or stratagems," and therefore answer to our "adroit moves," or "dexterous piloting," or "skilful maneuvering."

The field here open to the careful reader of the classics is immense. Every page presents its problems. Words of an apparently general import clamor for identification. Innocent-looking terms may be bandits in disguise. Greek and Latin words, if sufficiently general, are much like the masks on the Greek stage which, while they gave a sort of general description, by no means fully revealed the identity of the actor. Where a specific term is lacking, the corresponding generic term plus the context supplies the deficiency. The joy of identifying such general, neutral, non-committal words in the light of the context borders on the joy of discovery. Shall we teachers skim over the printed page in an effort to "cover the ground," or shall we not rather pause, at times at least, to give both ourselves and our students the delight of the discoverer? If we do, we shall find the old Romans (and Greeks) were just as "modern" as we moderns are ourselves. JAMES A. KLEIST, S. J.

#### Leisure Hour Readings

1. *Herodotus*, I, 23-24, 30-33, 85-91, 189-192.
2. *Ovid, Metamorphoses*, I, 1-312, 348-415; II, 1-48, 103-328; III, 1-137; IV, 612-662; VI, 1-145, 340-381; VIII, 183-259, 611-724; IX, 157-272; X, 86-144; XI, 1-193; XV, 871-879.

3. The brief sketch of Roman literature by J. Wight-Duff in the "World's Manuals" series. (The larger work by the same author, "A Literary History of Rome," is the best modern book on the subject in English, and should be found in every classical library.) F. A. P.

For practical purposes, especially in the matter of reading at sight, the conjunction *cum* has only three meanings: *when*, *since*, and *although*. Out of a hundred occurrences in Caesar, the chances are that it will mean "when" in 70 cases; "since" in 24, and "although" in 6. In Cicero the probabilities are as follows: "when" 60; "since" 22, and "although" 18. In Vergil *cum* nearly always means "when." H. P. O.

### Conditional Sentences

Most teachers of Latin and Greek will readily admit that the most difficult chapters in the grammar of either language are those which deal with Conditional Sentences. The difficulties usually revolve about two centers of confusion, viz., what is the real difference between simple conditions and those which are classed as potential and unreal? and secondly, what is the distinction between the present potential and the present unreal? In the process of translating from English into Latin, the question takes the following practical form: When must I use the subjunctive instead of the indicative, and when must I use the present subjunctive instead of the imperfect?

These difficulties take their rise not so much from any mystery surrounding the Latin construction, as from the illusive nature of the auxiliary and modal verbs in English. No pupil can possibly master Latin or Greek conditionals until he has first mastered the various meanings of the modal verbs in English. Let us take a few examples. The verb *would* may denote willingness, and should then be translated by a past form of *volo*; it may denote habitual action, which would be rendered into Latin by the use of the imperfect, or by a form of *soleo*; it may denote potentiality and require the Latin subjunctive; and lastly it may be the preterite of the future auxiliary *will*, employed in indirect discourse. In this case it must be expressed in Latin by the future infinitive after a verb of saying. The verb *should* may likewise denote past futurity, or obligation, or mere potentiality, and each of these ideas will require a different construction in Latin. The verb *may* often denotes permission, and is to be translated by *licet*; it sometimes denotes possibility, and requires the *fieri potest ut* construction. It is an unfortunate fact that some grammars start the pupil off on the wrong track by telling him that the form *amem* means *I may love*. It never has this meaning in an independent sentence, and it can be so translated in only a few dependent clauses. Other grammars give the meaning *may I love*, which is justified only for the optative subjunctive. Allen and Greenough act far more sanely in giving no meaning at all. The reason is stated in a footnote: "All translations of the subjunctive are misleading and hence none is given." Several recent grammars follow their example, but it has remained for "Foster and Arms" to defy traditional methods of teaching by postponing all mention of the subjunctive to the beginning of second year, where the forms can be employed at once in their proper field, i. e., in clauses of purpose, result, etc.

From what has been said, it is clear that any intelligent handling of Conditional Sentences, especially in the process of translating from English into Latin, must be based upon principles which will not leave the pupil at the mercy of the English auxiliary and modal verbs. It is imperative that he base his reasoning on the thought of the sentence alone. This sounds platitudinous, but any teacher who has spent a year in the class-room knows that there is nothing more foreign to the usual

activity of the high-school mind than regard for the thought that underlies language.

The following treatment of conditional sentences is offered in the hope that it may assist the busy teacher in finding a clear-cut method of handling a rather hazy subject. The method has been used by a number of Latin teachers in the province with satisfactory results.

We shall start with a definition. "A conditional sentence is a complex sentence in which the thought of the main clause is represented as depending for its realization upon the reality of the thought contained in the subordinate clause." The subordinate clause is usually introduced by the conjunction *if*. In this article we shall retain the expressions "protasis" and "apodosis," though for class-room work it might be better to speak of the "if-clause" and the "main clause." It is well to remember that grammatically the protasis depends upon the apodosis; logically the apodosis depends upon the protasis.

The most important thing to know about a declarative conditional sentence is this: Just what piece of information does it convey? Most grammars do not emphasize this element sufficiently, and no high-school pupil has ever given me a correct answer to this question. Let us make it clear at once that the information conveyed by a declarative conditional sentence is that there exists a connection of dependence between the idea of the main clause and the idea of the subordinate clause. To say "If it rains, there will be no game," is only another way of saying that the playing of the game depends upon the weather. We get no absolute information about either game or weather, though some grammars seem to imply that we do in a certain type of conditional sentence, which they designate as the "more vivid future." Later on we shall endeavor to justify the term "more vivid future," with the understanding, however, that it should never be brought into the high school class-room.

The fact stated by the conditional sentence is, therefore, the fact that one thing depends upon the other for its realization. In the interrogative sentence, "Will there be a game if it rains?" the information sought is this, "Is there a connection between game and weather?" or, "Will the playing of the game depend upon the weather?" In the imperative sentence, "Call off the game if it rains," the person addressed is instructed to put a connection between game and weather, such that if the weather be unfavorable, the game must not be played.

These three examples, stating, asking about, or commanding, a connection between game and weather, represent the simple conditional sentence, which requires the indicative (or imperative) mood in Latin.

Besides this first type, we have a second type of conditional sentence, and we shall recognize only two. Besides stating the fact of connection, the second type implies further information, i. e. that the whole situation is imaginary, that it is a mere supposition. But are not all conditional sentences based upon supposition? Are

they not all imaginary? In a certain sense, yes; but it is one thing to make a statement which is suppositional and imaginary, and it is quite another thing to call attention to the fact that it is *only* suppositional and imaginary. This the second type does by implication.

It is important to distinguish between the meanings of to *express* and to *imply*. To *express* is to state directly and in so many words; to *imply* is to *take for granted*, to *suggest*, to *hint at*, to *convey indirectly*. To say that "the man might have been killed" states directly that there was a possibility of his being killed. The fact that he was not killed is not stated directly; it is implied by the tone of the sentence. If his death was a fact, I would have stated it as a fact. By stating it as a mere possibility, I imply that it was not a fact. "If you were an honest man" is an incomplete sentence, and hence does not state anything. It does, however, go far enough to imply that there is some doubt as to the honesty of the person addressed.

The two types of conditional sentences, then, have this in common: they both state a connection. They have this difference: the second implies that the situation is only imaginary; the first has no such implication.

Conditional sentences of both types may refer to past, present or future situations. In the first type, a change of time introduces no difference in regard to the nature of the sentence. The connection between the two ideas undergoes no modification. In the second type, likewise, the connection remains unchanged, but the implication that the situation is imaginary will bear a different coloring in the future from that which it bears in the present or the past. I cannot refer to a present or a past situation as imaginary, unless I know, or pretend to know, that it does not, or did not, actually exist. Hence to say that a present or past situation is imaginary, is the same as to say that it is unreal. This does not hold true for future situations, which we can conceive as imaginary without denying their possible future reality. We have no type of conditional sentence which implies impossibility, just as we have no type which implies actual fulfillment. What then is the difference between the future conditions of the first type and those of the second type? Those of the first type are colorless; the mind is occupied only with the connection between the two ideas; those of the second type are tinged with a slight shade of improbability, at least to the extent that the speaker calls attention to the fact that he does not know how the situation will turn out. In order to avoid being taken too seriously, or in order to avoid all suspicion that he is looking at the situation as likely to be fulfilled, he uses a form of expression which is equivalent to saying, "Let's just suppose." In this sense, this type of condition can be referred to as the "less vivid future," and the ordinary future of the first type will by contrast appear somewhat more vivid, though in itself it remains, as we have said, absolutely colorless.

An example will make this clear. In the sentence, "If I go, I shall take you with me," the mind is occupied solely with the thought that "my departure will not separate us." Changed to the second type, the sentence

would read, "If I were to go, I should take you with me." Here the mind still insists upon the thought that "we shall not be separated," but it finds room for the added implication that the situation is as yet only imaginary; my going is still problematical; I have not made up my mind as yet; there may be no need for my going.

What shall we do for names? As the terms "first type" and "second type" are not very illuminating, it would be better to speak of "simple conditions" and "imaginary conditions." I suggest the use of the term "simple condition" in spite of Fr. Donovan's advice to the contrary (CLASSICAL BULLETIN, vol. II, p. 64). A simple condition states simply the connection; an imaginary condition does this and more: it implies that the situation has existence only in the mind of the speaker. The term "imaginary" has been chosen because it is a familiar word, is highly descriptive, and at the same time, is sufficiently accurate. It would be well, however, gradually to substitute the more technical term "potential," since this word is used by all the grammars.

In practice, then, when the pupil is confronted with a sentence to be translated, he will ask himself the question, "Does this sentence contain a simple straightforward statement of connection, or has it a potential twist, i. e. is there something hazy about it, something unreal, or doubtful, or queer, no matter just what?" In the first case, it will belong to the simple type, and require the indicative mood; in the second, it will belong to the imaginary type, and take the subjunctive. This decided, there is only one other question to be asked, "Does the situation pertain to the past, to the present, or to the future?" The sense and the sense alone must be his guide; he must visualize the scene. He need not, however, try to grasp the philosophic difference between "present potentiality" and "present unreality." While it is true that the two are specifically different, this difference rests ultimately on a difference in time. Present unreality is hopelessly unreal, because the present, like the past, is unchangeable; present potentiality, while in a certain sense unreal, is not hopelessly unreal, because it looks to the future, and the future always holds out a possibility of being realized. Hence we have endeavored to solve this Gordian knot by cleaving it with a time-distinction.

If the pupil finds that he is dealing with a sentence of the simple type, he will, after determining the time of the situation, choose his tenses according to ordinary usage, remembering that the imperfect denotes continued action in past time, and that the verb in the if-clause must take one of the "perfect" or "finished-action" tenses if its thought is represented as preceding that of the main verb. If he is dealing with a sentence of the imaginary type, he will in the main clause use the present subjunctive to refer to future time, the imperfect to refer to present time, and the pluperfect for past time. As a mnemonic help, his attention should be called to the fact that the tense lags, as it were, one step behind the time of the action to be expressed. To denote simultaneous action, the verb of the protasis will follow

the main verb, but to denote antecedent action, the perfect subjunctive or the pluperfect subjunctive must be used for imaginary future or present situations respectively.

The use of the imperfect subjunctive to denote a contrary-to-fact situation in past time, should not be mentioned until the use of the above rules has become instinctive. This remark holds also for the presentation of the use of the subjunctive with the indefinite second person in protases of the first type, which should be treated as a real exception; and for the use of the indicative in the case of such verbs as *possum* and *debeo*. This last construction should be explained in the ordinary way, viz., that since the notion of potentiality is contained in the very meaning of the verb, it need not again be expressed by the mood, except by way of attraction to the normal type, or by way of emphasis; in which case the notion of possibility or obligation is itself made conditional and imaginary.

In a future article these same principles will be applied to conditional sentences in Greek; and a few practical hints will be suggested for recognizing the type to which any given conditional sentence belongs.

HUGH P. O'NEILL, S. J.

**Roman Education, from Cicero to Quintilian,** by  
Aubrey Gwynn, S. J. Oxford University Press,  
American Branch.

This volume, as Father Gwynn tells us in his preface, is the result of work begun ten years ago for the Master's thesis in the National University of Ireland. It deals with the theory, rather than the practice of Roman Education, and traces the gradual development of this theory of education, beginning with the early Roman traditions, and on through the modifications introduced by the Scipionic circle and carried on by the flock of Greek tutors, rhetoricians, philosophers, and critics, let loose upon Italy after Pydna, of whom the most outstanding were Polybius and Panaetius.

The system outlined by Cicero in the "De Oratore" forms the basis of that part of Father Gwynn's discussion which deals with the closing days of the Republic. This is followed by an examination of the theories advocated by Quintilian. Father Gwynn does not, however, confine his researches to Cicero and Quintilian. A mere glance at the foot of any page will show that he has gone to most of the ancient as well as nearly all of the modern authorities.

The book is the fruit of very diligent study and tireless research, as is shown on every page. It is a book for the advanced student, and even the specialist. It deals with a very particularized field of study, but will prove of interest and profit to every student of ancient culture. It is unmistakably the work of a scholar, but that has not prevented it from being written in a very clear, flowing, and pleasing style. The print is large and clear and pleasing to the eye; the binding a bit frail. But as it is a book for the library, rather than for the class-room, this defect is of secondary importance.

and readily overlooked where everything else is of such superior excellency. The book is provided with a comprehensive bibliography and an *index rerum* together with an *index nominum*.

W. J. Y.

**Orationes Philippicae: Prima et Secunda,** M. Tulli Ciceronis in M. Antonium. Edited with Introduction, Notes (mainly historical), and Appendices, by J. D. Denniston, Fellow and Tutor of Hertford College, Oxford. Oxford University Press, American Branch, New York.

This edition of Cicero's Philippies I and II is refreshing. It is unnumbered with grammatical and syntactical minutiae, while it furnishes illuminating historical background by means of quotations from contemporary writers, brief and to the point, and other helpful historical notes. This material—120 pages of it—enables the student to arrive at an independent decision, which frequently enough will be quite at variance with the editor's. The editor seems to anticipate this: in his preface he states that a colleague, who read the work in proof, dissents strongly from his estimate of Cicero's character, and concludes the preface: "I have not wilfully set out to traduce my author, and where I have criticized him, I think I have always brought evidence to the support of my judgment." My own view is that this evidence is frequently given the interpretation most unfavorable to Cicero.

A. M. Z.

**The Works of Aristotle Translated into English:**  
*Catagoriae, De Interpretatione*, by E. M. Edghill;  
*Analytica Priora*, by A. J. Jenkinson; *Analytica Posteriora*, by G. R. G. Mure. Oxford University Press, American Branch, New York.

The late Sir William Ridgeway used in his later years occasionally to say to his youthful pupils: "You people read too much Plato nowadays, and not enough Aristotle." Whilst we, in this country, need not plead guilty on the first count, even those of us who are both classicists and scholastic philosophers, perhaps too seldom take up the pages of "the Master of them that know." The complete translation of the works of the Stagirite in eleven volumes, undertaken by competent English scholars, and now more than half published, may hearten many to seek wisdom in the pages of Aristotle, where wisdom is surely to be found in plenty, but not without hard intellectual toil. The four treatises contained in the present volume cover general metaphysics and logic. The translation is clear and vigorous, and there are convenient analytical tables of contents at the beginning of each treatise.

F. A. P.

The Loyola University Press announces that a vocabulary for Cicero's "De Senectute" and one for the second book of Xenophon's "Anabasis," will be ready for use by January 15. The revised edition of the vocabulary for the second book of Vergil's "Aeneid" will be on the market by March 1.

# The Classical Bulletin

Published bi-monthly by the Classical Association of the Missouri Province.

Address all communications to  
THE CLASSICAL BULLETIN, Florissant, Missouri.

*Officers of the Classical Association*

President.....Francis A. Preuss, S.J.  
Secretary.....Hugh P. O'Neill, S.J.

## The Classical Bulletin

EDITOR

Francis A. Preuss, S.J.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Hugh P. O'Neill, S.J.	Alphonse M. Zamiara, S.J.
Claude H. Heithaus, S.J.	William R. Hennes, S.J.
Reginald R. Lefebvre, S.J.	Oscar J. LaPlante, S.J.

Vol. III

DECEMBER, 1926

No. 2

In a paper read before the British Classical Association on October 8, Professor Werner Jaeger, professor of Greek in the University of Berlin, declares that there has been a serious diminution in the number of *Gymnasien* classical schools in Germany since 1918. The new political order, he said, looked upon humanism with mistrust, as before the war humanism was conceived to be in closest alliance with the old order. Whilst he admitted that the champions of humanism had a firm basis in the incomparable educational traditions of antiquity, he accused them today of inconsistency with their own principles. They have lost themselves, he said, in philology and archeology, and have proved themselves incapable of defending the necessity of humanism as an educational force, as the means of supplying a spiritual need. Scholarship must emerge from its historical phase, he declared, and must fill itself with missionary zeal, and confront the crude and inharmonious life of our day with the ripe feelings that the life of happier generations experienced. These are hard, but wise and brave words, which American scholars too would do well to take to heart. Professor Jaeger sees a gleam of hope for the future, however, in the establishment in Germany last year of the "*Gesellschaft fuer Antike Kultur*" and its quarterly organ, "*Die Antike*." This organization is spreading rapidly, he said, and developing plans to make the works of ancient art and literature more accessible to the people.

The presidential address of Lord Chief Justice Hewart at the same meeting of the B. C. A., as reported in the *Times* of October 9, contains some interesting points. The speaker quoted a brilliant scholar, who, when lately asked, what we owe to the classics, replied: "Profound self-dissatisfaction." This reply he contrasted and harmonized with the lines of Mr. Justice Denman, written forty years ago,

"Carmina quae puero, vix intellecta, placebant,  
Auspice te, referunt gaudia quanta seni!"

"If it had been possible," he continued, "to cross-examine the author of either of those phrases upon the debt of mankind to the classics, might not they have mentioned, first and foremost, the stimulus that was offered by a group of great and enthralling writers, whose ideals or goals were never sordid material prosperity, but always spiritual excellence? . . . Might not they point a contrast between the finely chiseled marble of those masterpieces, and the loose, diffuse, and slipshod language—or would they permit themselves to say the "lingo"—of so many writers of today? . . . It would be odd, would it not? if the witness had not the courage to say that, as there is nothing new under the sun, and nothing modern except perhaps more rapid and dangerous methods of locomotion, there is no contemporary puzzle or problem upon which the ancient classics do not throw light . . . Printing, he might think, is by no means an unmixed blessing. The cataract of printed matter every day can drown thought in a roar of noise.

Reading which is a mere suction of print into the mind is, the witness might say, no more intellectual than the suction of tobacco-smoke into the mouth . . . There is no reading a classic without conscious effort, and this effort, when there is also matter of substance and nutriment to reward it, makes the value of reading. . . . And without doubt our witness would have much to say of the value of Latin Prose as an instrument of education—that subtle and testing exercise which, while it demands not only grammatical accuracy, but also literary knowledge and imagination, compels a person even against his will to be perfectly honest with his own mind, never imagining or persuading himself that he understands or can express what he has only half thought out." The address contains much more that is valuable concerning the defects of modern writing, and the need we have of Roman discipline and Greek freedom and originality in our present-day education.

We are printing in this issue of the BULLETIN a number of communications, in which the recommendations of the Classical Association of the Missouri Province, notably those concerning Foster and Arms' *First-Year Latin* and Bradley-Arnold's *Latin Prose Composition*, are frankly discussed. The primary purpose of the Association in making these two recommendations was, to have the books in question thoroughly examined, or tried out, by the teachers of the province during the present scholastic year, and report their findings in the BULLETIN, so that by the time the next annual convention comes round, both the Association and the Prefect General of Studies might have reliable data to work on. We are very glad that some teachers have already given the matter their attention and sent in their views. We only hope that many more will follow their example. Perhaps some of those who do not approve the books under discussion may be able to suggest others, which they regard as more suitable for our purpose. We also

hope that the classical teachers will express themselves on the question of reintroducing Greek into second year high of the classical (Latin-Greek) course.

### Books Received

From the Oxford University Press, American Branch:  
*Reddenda Minima*, A Latin Translation Book for  
 Beginners, by T. K. E. Batterbury, M. A.  
*Noctuinus*, Dramatic Dialogues, by R. B. Appleton,  
 M. A. (*Lingua Latina Series*).  
*The Mind of Rome* (Companion volume to R. W.  
 Livingstone's *Pageant of Greece*). Contributions  
 by Cyril Bailey, J. Bell, J. G. Barrington-Ward,  
 T. F. Higham, A. N. Bryan-Brown, H. E. Butler,  
 Maurice Platnauer, Charles Singer. Edited by  
 Cyril Bailey.

**Sappho, The Poems and Fragments** (Broadway  
 Translations), Greek Text with an English Trans-  
 lation, by C. R. Haines, M. A. (Cantab.), etc., with  
 20 plates; xvi and 255 pp. Routledge, London—  
 E. P. Dutton & Co., New York.

The purpose of this volume, in the words of the preface, is "to provide the general public with a popular, yet not unscholarly, and a comprehensive edition of Sappho, containing all that is so far known of her unique personality and her incomparable poems." It contains all the poems and fragments (certain or dubious), to the number of 173; as well as fourteen other poems relating to Sappho or attributed to her. For the illustrations, sculpture in the round and in relief, vases, gems, coins, and bronzes have been drawn on with excellent effect.

In his long and interesting introduction Mr. Haines discusses all the available evidence concerning the life and character of Sappho. He agrees with Wilamowitz and others in "putting away once for all with a clear conscience . . . the hateful suspicions that have clung to and disfigured" Sappho's character.

We know that Sappho's poems were arranged in nine books, and that the first book alone, in one edition, contained 1320 lines. All that we now possess is a scant 500 lines! Mr. Haines is very severe on the ecclesiastical authorities, to whom the final disappearance of Sappho's poems, towards the close of the eleventh century, is commonly attributed. The excellence of such fragments as that preserved by the author of the "Treatise on the Sublime," does make one sigh that not at least one entire book of Sappho has been preserved to us, when so many volumes of second rate Greek literature have escaped the ravages of time.

But now the study of Sappho has become largely a matter of vague conjecture and strange dreaming; such as Swinburne indulged in, when he expanded a tempting fragment into the following:

'Ηοάμαν μὲν ἔγῳ σέθεν, 'Ατθί, πάλαι πότα.

"I loved thee"—hark, one tenderer note than all—  
 "Atthis, of old time once"—one low long fall

Sighing—one long low lovely loveless call  
 Dying—one pause in song so flamelike fast—  
 "Atthis, long since in old time overpast"—  
 One soft first pause and last.

Similarly Mr. Haines has versified, not a fragment, but a sentiment, attributed to Sappho by Aristides:

To me the Muses truly gave  
 An envied and a happy lot:  
 E'en when I lie within the grave,  
 I cannot, shall not, be forgot.

The famous compliment of Alceaeus to Sappho, and Sappho's answer to it, are thus rendered:

Pure gently-smiling Sappho, violet-crowned,  
 Fain would I speak, but shame my lips hath bound.

If noble words and fair had been thy will,  
 Nor had thy tongue therewith been mingling ill,  
 Shame had not veiled thy faltering eyes,  
 And thou hadst spok'n in honest wise.

Other well known lines, with Mr. Haines' renderings of them, follow:

Μνάσεσθαι τίνα φαῖμι καὶ ὕστερον ἀμμέων,

is translated:

Mark me! The after days shall see  
 Those that will still remember me.

The fine lines,

ὅ μὲν γὰρ κάλος, ὅσσον ἴδην, πέλεται [κάλος],  
 δὸ δὲ καύαθος αὐτίκα καὶ κάλος ἔσσεται,

are rendered:

He that is fair, fair only is to see:  
 He that is good, fair too shall straightway be.

Here are two beautiful lines about the cricket:

. . . πτερύγων ὑπακαχέει λιγύραν ἀοίδαν,  
 ὅπποτα φλόγιον κατέταν ἐπιπτάμενον καταύλει.

His shrill notes from beneath his wings  
 Outpoured, the sweet cicala sings,  
 What time he charms away the fiery heat.

Following is one of the most famous of all the shorter fragments:

Οἰον τὸ γλυκύμαλον ἐρεύθεται ἄκρῳ ἐπ' ὕσδω,  
 ἄκρον ἐτ' ἀκροτάτῳ λελάθοντο δὲ μαλοδρότης·  
 οὐ μὰν ἐλελάθοντ', ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐδύναντ' ἐπίκεσθαι.

As a sweet-apple rosy,  
 At the uttermost tip of the uttermost bough,  
 Unseen in the autumn by the gatherers' eyes—  
 Nay, seen, but only to tantalize.

Here the translator is perhaps not so happy in reproducing the simple charm of the original.

All in all, Mr. Haines has given us a very fresh and interesting volume, at once popular and scholarly.

F. A. P.

### Communications

#### *Foster and Arms' "First Year Latin"*

To the Editor of the CLASSICAL BULLETIN: The third recommendation submitted by the Classical Convention to the Prefect General of Studies last August was: "That Foster and Arms' 'First Year Latin' be substituted for Bennett in first year high school." In the October issue of the BULLETIN all teachers of first year Latin are requested to give the book a thorough examination and report their findings to the editors. As I formerly taught first year Latin, and have examined "Foster and Arms" rather carefully, I can claim a hearing. The merits and demerits of the book should be fully discussed before it is generally adopted as a class text, the more so since the time allowed for such discussion at the August meeting was necessarily quite inadequate.

I agree with the detailed findings of the committee which reported on the book in every respect but one. "Small vocabularies, short lessons, striking simplicity and clearness, 'aural' exercises, early introduction of connected reading matter, frequent vocabulary reviews, English derivatives from Latin, excellent maps and illustrations,"—all these are very commendable features in a first year Latin book. But in "presenting the etymology to the end of the regular verb," the main objective of first year Latin, according to recommendation first, I maintain that "Foster and Arms" is singularly deficient. The several declensions and conjugations form logical units, and it is psychologically and pedagogically sound to teach them as such. I mean that the average student can more easily acquire and more permanently retain the first conjugation, for example, if he studies it part by part on successive days, than if he learns the present indicative active today, the corresponding passive six months from now, while memorizing in the meantime various other bits of nouns, pronouns, other conjugations, in a similar piece-meal fashion. Now in Foster and Arms' "First Year Latin" the first conjugation is treated in Lessons 1, 4, 6, 7, 14, 25, 29, 30, 46, 47, 62, etc., and not completed till Lesson 118. Third declension nouns are not begun till Lesson 51,—long after personal and reflexive pronouns,—and continued in Lessons 52, 55, 60, 63, 64, 67, 68. The fourth and fifth declensions are postponed until the beginning of the third semester, in Lessons 104 and 106. The other etymological units are treated in a similar disjointed sequence. If this book is adopted, I fail to see how recommendation first can be carried out.

I readily admit that most first year Latin books have this very same defect. But Bennett's "Foundations of Latin" and "First Year Latin" are exceptions. They present the etymological units in logical sequence. It was this feature, I always thought, that influenced the authorities years ago in selecting Bennett for our schools.

The commendable features of "Foster and Arms" are found in large measure in Bennett as well. Furthermore, in our first year Latin teaching we have always, I believe, insisted on "small vocabularies and short les-

sons for each day"; we are "clear and simple in our explanations; we certainly need no urging to insist on "aural exercise"; we have "frequent vocabulary reviews" without "Foster and Arms."

*St. Louis U. Normal.*

A. M. ZAMIARA, S. J.

#### *First Year Latin*

To the Editor of the CLASSICAL BULLETIN: Fathers A, B, C, D, and the undersigned deprecate unreservedly the project of introducing "Foster and Arms" in first year Latin.

The book is subversive of the idea of first year,—thorough, systematic grounding in the *forms*. We want early introduction of "the stark array of case-forms," etc.; system—one thing at a time, *thoroughly*. A first year book should be a drill book. There is no use letting boys think there is some *easy way*.

If ever there was confusion—the opposite of "one thing at a time" (in proper order), we have it in F. & A.

What we want is the five declensions first and thoroughly, placed so that they can be compared with one another easily; moderate vocabularies of words of these declensions, with *barely enough* other words (verbs, prepositions) to use all the cases in exercises. To the end of the declensions all the verb my boys get is four words: *est, sunt, habet, habent*; perhaps *dat* and *dant* also, for using the dative. But while on declensions, "*declensions only*" is the watchword. So for the rest. "*Continuous readings early*" is good if it does not contravene the above. But usually it introduces at once a whole array of verbs—immediate confusion!

We do not see how boys could finish their first year on F. & A. with a *clear-cut* knowledge of forms, lucidly arranged in local memory. They would go into second year loose and shaky in both declensions and conjugations.

Bennett is imperfect—but infinitely preferable to the disorderly F. & A.

*St. Louis U. High.*

W. F. HENDRIX, S. J.

#### *For Foster and Arms*

To the Editor of the CLASSICAL BULLETIN: Among the recommendations made by the Classical Convention at Chicago last summer is one advising that Foster and Arms' "First Year Latin" be substituted for Bennett. A committee, previously appointed, had gone over all the first year books that have any vogue at present, and their choice fell on Foster and Arms, with D'Ooge as the second choice. The members of the Classical Association present at the convention agreed, in the main, with the points which the committee advanced in favor of the book. Many of them examined the book page by page, as attention was called to the different points. Thus the recommendation was not put forward inconsiderately, nor as a trial to the already strained patience and endurance of first year teachers.

Now, what is there in Foster and Arms that appeals? I might stress the short, practical vocabularies; the com-

paratively large number of English and Latin sentences illustrative of the rules; the early introduction of connected discourse, so that the pupil learns at the beginning of his course that Latin can sustain an idea and does not express merely a lot of incoherent "stuff" about the "good girl," "the bad farmer," and the "small sailor"; the handy review lessons, Latin-English and English-Latin, which are introduced every twenty pages; the arrangement of the lessons, with the rules and vocabulary on one side of the page and the exercise on the other—thus making it necessary for our student to inform the teacher of his deficiency in vocabulary by turning the page to get the word he does not know. I might stress these points, but I simply mention them, and choose the following as the point of importance: Bennett teaches Latin *formally*, Foster and Arms' teaches it *functionally*. We want it taught functionally.

Now what do I mean by formal and functional teaching? To study a language formally is to study it as a science; to study it functionally is to study it as a medium of thought. Formally, I learn the different parts of a language, after I have broken it up into nouns, adjectives, adverbs, pronouns, verbs; and finally, I shake a little syntax over the whole to fill up the chinks. Functionally, I learn a thing, whether it be noun, adjective, or verb form, so that I may put it into use at once. The formal study lays in a staggering supply of forms. The functional aims at the same knowledge of forms and the same drill, but it demands, in addition, an immediate use of the forms, as they are learned. The former keeps the child, as it were, in the cradle until five years of age, filling it with theory about running; then it grandly commands it to leap up and run a hundred yards. The latter, the functional method, shows it how to walk and then has it try a few steps. It is a question of theoretical knowledge versus practice. Induce the rival coach to confine his attention chiefly to "skull" practice, while your team is tackling and blocking and serrimaging nightly, and I can assure you that your rival will soon be "meat" for your reserves.

Let me be practical. I have been teaching Latin in second and third year high. In the repetition at the beginning of the year I found that second year was able to rattle off forms with startling rapidity. "Really a marvelous class," I thought to myself. Then we started translating. After due prelection, they came prepared, ostensibly, to recite. I stood aghast. "What case is *Caesarem*? Accusative? Then why do you translate it as the subject?" "Oh, yes." And then another guess is made. They have never been made to feel the force of an accusative,—as they would have been in the functional method. And as for the difference between active and passive, well—. Yet, tell them to run through the present indicative passive, or the form in which "I am loved" occurs, and they will do it as fast as you yourself can. If we have been teaching by the formal method, let us begin to teach by the functional. Foster and Arms is a book written for functional teaching.

In third year I found the feeling for the significance of the forms no better. Sometimes a truly pitiable condition is reached in this year. Their parrot memory has deserted them, and they are left with no consolation; unable to rattle off the forms, and equally unable to coax any meaning from the mysteriously placed words, with their mysterious endings.

Frankly, I grew discouraged more than once, and thought what a wretched teacher I must be. But when I compared notes with other teachers, I began to brighten up. They were experiencing the same difficulties. Surely, all of us were not incompetent! Could it be that the fault lay in first year? Perhaps; but with a big restriction. Most of our first year teachers are teaching their matter excellently. Some have perfected their systems by an experience of many years. And they do attain their objective. But here is the rub. Their objective is Latin learnt formally: a mastery of declensions and conjugations as such. What we need, it seems to me, is Latin *in use*, Latin as a medium of thought, Latin as a language.

Foster and Arms has met with great opposition; and naturally so. A first year teacher derives a good deal of consolation from a rapid, unerring recitation of forms. This ability in his students may represent to him the sum total of progress in Latin; and to deviate from his course of giving this ability, may seem to him destructive of all ideals, so long cherished and striven for.

Now arises the problem of shaking this deep-seated conviction. One means would be, to have one teacher in each school try the new method, so that comparisons between the results of both could be made. Another would be to advance first year teachers, who follow the formal method, with their classes. Perhaps they would have the same experience in second and third year as other teachers have had,—they might find in their boys a helplessness in the *use* of carefully learned forms. They would know that their first year work had been done as well as mortal could do it. And then the only conclusion would be, that their *method* had been deficient, that it had been formal, whereas it should have been functional.

X.

#### *Anent Bradley-Arnold*

To the Editor of the CLASSICAL BULLETIN: Just a word about the recommendation of "Bradley-Arnold" by the Classical teachers, as reported in the current issue of the CLASSICAL BULLETIN. The assumption underlying the recommendation needs to be scrutinized with care, it seems to me.

It is assumed, I imagine, that during the period when "Bradley-Arnold" was used in the province, Latin was written better than at any other time in the province's history. Are there facts to substantiate this claim? First of all, to my memory, "Bradley-Arnold" was not used before 1910; it was certainly not used in 1918. Did the high-school boys of that time write better Latin than the generations that succeeded them? Better than the generations that preceded? I am aware that at an earlier period "Arnold" *simpliciter* was used in some of our

colleges; but the question is about "Bradley-Arnold." Moreover, if the 1910-18 generation wrote better Latin, was it necessarily on account of the textbook? May it not have been because of a more simplified curriculum, less outside interests, more time devoted to Latin? I refuse to believe that a textbook or its absence is the cause of the decline of Latin writing, if decline there be. It seems to me that this textbook cult that somehow or other has seized hold of the province, that sees in X's book or Y's book a panacea for all our pedagogic ills, is sheer nonsense and will never get us anywhere.

Before readopting "Bradley-Arnold" these things should be considered. Moreover, have any of the proponents of the text sought to find out why it was rejected? I taught the book in second year high, and I frankly believe that it is an impossible book for the American high school. We are simply not ready for it; and sufficient time is not allotted in our schedule to work at "Bradley-Arnold" thoroughly. That the book is an excellent guide to the essentials of Latin style is beside the point. We do not introduce Genung's Rhetorica with all its excellencies into first year high. "Bradley-Arnold" was written for English schools; their program and our program are not the same. If it is true, as I have heard from American Jesuits at Cambridge, that the English public school boy, after his six years of Latin, is further advanced than the American college sophomore, possibly further than most American college graduates who have majored in Latin, then isn't it absurd to take a textbook that is used in the upper classes of the English schools and introduce it into our high schools? Briefly, the textbook fits into their system; it does not fit into ours. By all means, change our system, bring it up to the same high standards as theirs; then introduce "Bradley-Arnold." But to imagine that a new textbook is going to revolutionize teaching is, to my thinking, the height of absurdity. The trouble with most of our high-school boys is not so much their inability to write fine Latin, idiomatic Latin, as it is their lack of familiarity with the bones of Latin grammar, declensions, conjugations, and the simpler rules of syntax. I do not say that Bennett meets this need; but I know from bitter experience that "Bradley-Arnold" does not. To use this book in second and third year high is almost on a par with teaching your English class how to write a short story or an oration before they know how to write a sentence.

*Loyola University.* WILLIAM J. McGUCKEN, S. J.

#### *Better than Arnold*

In view of the storm clouds that are gathering over the proposal to reinstate "Bradley-Arnold" in the high school Latin course, I would like to present the teachers of Latin with a lightning-arrester in the shape of a new book, whose presence in the field will, I think, render unnecessary any further discussion of "Bradley-Arnold." The book that I have in mind is called "The Gateway to Latin Composition." It is the work of three English scholars, Messrs. Sonnenschein, Wilkinson, and Odell, and is published by the Oxford University

Press. To my mind this book embodies the very qualities which we had in mind when we voted to recommend "Arnold" at the convention last summer; and at the same time it is free from the objections which are justly urged by those who think that "Arnold" has no place in our high-school course. Briefly the merits of the new book are these:

1. It emphasizes important constructions and does not confuse the pupil with a mass of detail.

2. Questions of English idiom and Latin style are handled in a very practical way. Latin idioms are explained wherever possible by reference to similar English constructions, thus *in media Italia* is compared with the English phrase "in mid Italy."

3. Instead of being treated to an analytic discussion of a given construction, the pupil is told how to recognize it when he meets it and how to go about translating it; for example, "The verb on which a dependent question depends always denotes some activity of the mind, such as asking, knowing, doubting, etc. Before a dependent question, the words 'the question' or 'the answer to the question' may always be supplied: for example, 'he did not know when the temple was built' means: 'he did not know the answer to the question: When was the temple built?'"

4. The exercises for translation are very copious, are well graded, and are couched in good English. Each lesson is provided with two or three sets of sentences, which are alternative to one another, thus giving the teacher ample opportunity to decide for himself how rapidly or how slowly the matter is to be covered. This feature also facilitates interesting repetition, for the teacher can base review work on sentences not seen during the first handling of the matter. These sentences are very short and are well adapted for oral translation in class.

5. In addition to these short sentences the book carries a large number of exercises in connected discourse. These exercises are interspersed with the others and are carefully graded. Taken in sequence, they present the pupil with a very interesting history of Rome. I consider this to be one of the outstanding features of the book.

6. The statement of each rule is accompanied by one or two very succinct examples, so constructed that the pupil may easily memorize them for use as models in his translation work. The book thus preserves one of the most praiseworthy features of Yenni's grammar.

As no book can be adequately appraised by anyone who merely thumbs its pages in the doubtful light of "the way I have always taught," I have taken the trouble to secure an expression of opinion from the first year Juniors at Florissant, who used "The Gateway" for about six months last year, after having struggled with "Arnold" for about two months. They are unanimous in proclaiming the book to be the "most interesting, the most simple, and the most profitable" textbook in Latin that they had ever used. Nearly all, each in his own informal way, lay great stress on its functional value. They claim that its influence on the quality of

their Latin in conversation became apparent after a few weeks. They are, however, not blind to the defects of the book, chief among these being the absence of an index. Two criticize the presentation of conditional sentences, one claims that the book sacrifices completeness to simplicity, and two do not like the treatment of the "subjunctive with weakened meaning." However, the least favorable critic of all ends his statements with the declaration that "The book gave me a wonderful grasp on Latin."

Although the book contains one hundred and thirty-six exercises, I doubt whether its forty-five chapters would afford sufficient matter for a three year course. Were "Foster and Arms" or a similar three-semester book introduced at the beginning of the course, the problem would be easily solved, for "The Gateway" could be introduced at the middle of second year. Another method would be to introduce "Arnold" into fourth year at the end of the first semester, thus paving the way for its continuation in college. "The Gateway" constitutes an admirable stepping stone to Arnold.

I have asked the publishers to send two copies of the book to each Prefect of Studies in the province. This they have agreed to do; and they have furthermore offered to send sample copies upon personal request to all teachers of Latin, so that they may examine the book at their leisure and in connection with their work during the remainder of the year. The price of the book is \$1.20 retail, subject to the usual discount to schools. The publishers' address is 35 West 32nd Street, New York City.

HUGH P. O'NEILL, S. J.

#### *Another Way*

To the Editor of the CLASSICAL BULLETIN: May I be permitted to suggest an entirely different solution from that urged in your October issue to the question of a first year Latin book and of a Latin Composition? I should be in favor of neither one nor the other. Time was when the teachers made up their own exercises. The teachers of the Ratio were supposed to make up their own simplified Latin and their own exercises. Are our teachers today incompetent?

Gildersleeve said somewhere that the ideal for language teachers was "a minimum of precept, a maximum of practice and early contact with the language in mass." That represents, I think, the ideal too of the *Ratio*. The shredded Latin and Greek of our first-year books is like the primer English, which occurs nowhere else in creation except in the school-book, which the pupil is made to learn carefully for a year and then told never to use again. Before and after the primer the pupil spoke intelligible and often idiomatic English. The use of such books, I fully believe, not only postpones the acquisition of a language, but in reality imposes bad habits, injurious to the language.

Simple Latin of Cicero, e. g. the Letters, simple Greek of Aesop's Fables, are the first-year books of the *Ratio*. The teacher does shred this language in class for drill, but the class has always before it the real, idiomatic, continuous prose, not an artificial, disconnected, inartistic

product. The first Greek I ever learned was a two line fable of Aesop, which was real literature and which still remains a perpetual delight in my memory. The wolf which was surprised that shepherds could eat mutton when itself might not, showed me at once that there was a human meaning to Greek. I am very glad that I never had White's sawdust served up to me. In our first-year English books the poetry is not shredded, but the prose is, and yet the poetry is more difficult than prose.

When I taught beginners' Latin, I had a continuous text after the first month. It was the *Epitome Historiae Sacrae*, but I am sorry it was not the Letters of Cicero, which I had in the second term. After one month I never gave disconnected sentences for Latin composition. The students wrote continuous prose based on the text, exemplifying the rules of grammar, and treating of a subject of the day. I succeeded with that method, which I think is in accordance with the *Ratio*, in making students write Latin letters in their second year Latin. In the drill work in class I often gave short sentences to exemplify declensions and conjugations and to give practice in grammar as we met the different parts of syntax, but the real literature was always in sight.

If I had a vote on the recommendations, I would advise taking the authors as they are in the *Ratio*, both in Latin and in Greek. The order of the Latin authors is based upon sound principles of true pedagogy; but on what principles the list "Caesar's Gallic Wars, Virgil's Aeneid and Cicero's Speeches" is based, I have never been able to find out. The natural and logical order of "letter, narration, essay, speech" is followed in the Latin prose of Cicero and paralleled with graded verse (Phaedrus, Ovid, Virgil's Eclogues, Georgics, Aeneid and Horace) and graded history (Nepos, Caesar, Sallust, Livy, Tacitus). Then, with precepts exemplified in the text and exercises based on the text, there would be unity and thoroughness in the teaching.

Exercise books are independent of the text and are not good literature. Exercise books give disconnected and unnatural prose. Exercise books are provided with "trots" after one year's use.

If, however, teachers are unable or unwilling to make up their own exercises, then let the teacher and the teacher alone have the exercise book and dictate the exercises. Perhaps this latter plan might force co-operation between class and teacher and do away with the fond delusion that exercise books automatically teach themselves by the simple process of assigning the next exercise and dictating from a key the Latin version of

St. Andrew-on-Hudson. FRANCIS P. DONNELLY, S. J.

#### *Jesuit Textbooks*

To the Editor of the CLASSICAL BULLETIN: May I recall a suggestion I made a long time ago to professors at Florissant, that we should launch an organized movement to prepare a whole set of characteristically Jesuit textbooks, especially in the classical field? It occurred to me at that time that if an outline were prepared of a series of standard textbooks, a great deal of the material

could be collected at the Juniorate. I suggested the establishment of a systematic file of models, the best wording of rules and the plans for teaching developed throughout the province.

My idea was: So many good teachers have flourished and passed away in the province each one developing interesting sets of notes of his own. These are lost for the common good because they are not gathered together and winnowed out. This could be done, it seems to me, in connection with the work of the Juniorate, if all the teachers were requested to send in their notes and outlines and whatever they have of special value. I offer you this suggestion for what it is worth.

*Marquette University.*      E. F. GARESCHÉ, S. J.

#### *Excerpts from Letters*

I noted with intense satisfaction that some of ours at least are coming round to the old idea of beginning Greek sooner and giving more time to it in the high school course.

*Loyola U., New Orleans.*      P. M. BROOKS, S. J.

As to your recommendations for high school: you are wise in first trying out "Foster and Arms." I have not yet seen the book, but I have ordered copies because of your article. But it happens quite often that we introduce a book first, and try it out afterwards, and find to our sorrow, that we made a mistake. About Recommendation 4 I am dubious. I was glad the book (Bradley-Arnold) was dropped from St. Ignatius, San Francisco. Perhaps, though, our difficulty has been yours, that the boys were not properly prepared. As to Number 5, we have, at St. Ignatius, been teaching Greek in second high for the last ten and more years. What we have not been doing is, to teach it for three years. They did so teach it until 1919, when the crowded course was simplified. The choice was History or Greek, as U. S. History was imperative in fourth high; so third Greek class went out of existence. It has come back again these last three years.

*Los Gatos, Cal.*      LEO S. SIMPSON, S. J.

#### Note on Anabasis Book I, Ch. 8, Par. 13

American editions of Xenophon agree in explaining the participle ὁρῶν and ὀζούσον of this passage as adversative. The context, however, in my opinion, demands that they be rendered as causal. The *ἄλλ' θμος* can be explained quite satisfactorily as adversative to the thought of the previous sentence, and translated "in spite of orders to the contrary." The whole passage will then read: (In the previous paragraph Cyrus ordered Clearchus to attack the King, adding, "If we conquer there, all our work is done.") "Yet when Clearchus saw the massed troops in the centre, and heard from Cyrus that the King was beyond the left wing,—the King was so superior in numbers that though at the centre of his army he was beyond Cyrus' left wing—Clearchus, in a spite of orders to the contrary, was unwilling to withdraw the right wing from the river.

because he feared lest he be surrounded from both sides."

This passage is fully discussed in the *Classical Journal* of 1916-17 by C. Knapp, J. M. Bridgham, G. C. Scoggin and M. W. Mather. The above explanation is practically the same as J. M. Bridgham's.

ALPHONSE M. ZAMIARA, S. J.

#### Reading at Sight—An Exercise

Reading at sight is no doubt the end of all Latin teaching. Nobody can enjoy a Latin author, or any author for that matter, unless he can read the text at sight. All explanations given on Vergil or Horace aim at nothing but this. The following exercise consists in emphasizing in detail the various mental operations which those reading at sight perform unconsciously. It may be employed in any class, and may very usefully begin after the first weeks of first high.

Take, or make up, a Latin sentence of moderate length, in the beginning not longer than four or five words; for instance, *Regis magna est clementia*. Write the first word on the blackboard, and ask for its meaning and case. Can it be the subject? Why not? Write the second word, *magna*. Ask for its meaning; its gender and case. (It may be nominative or vocative singular, feminine; or nominative, accusative or vocative plural, neuter. All this must be brought out by the students. If the class is not yet acquainted with the substantive use of the neuter plural, do not bother them with it now.) Can it belong to *regis*? Can it belong to the subject? If so, in what number and gender may the subject be? Explain that it may be either attribute or predicate, unless the class itself finds this out. Write *est*. Get its meaning. It evidently is the verb of the sentence. (I personally use the term *verb*, in preference to *predicate*). In what number will the subject be? in what gender? Write *clementia*, and put the period after it. Get its meaning. May it be the subject? If so, what word will belong to it? Is *magna* attribute or predicate? Why? This is, of course, decided by *est*. If the students do not see this readily, tell them so. Translate *magna est clementia*. Now, what are we going to do with *regis*? Now translate the whole sentence.

Go through many rather simple sentences in this way. Generally keep the greater part of each sentence easy, and let them always be short, so that the class may soon reach a definite result. Take only one sentence in each lesson, unless the class is eager to do more. Do not keep the class guessing too long, but give the answer yourself, if they cannot find it readily. Select or compose the sentences as carefully as you can. But do not waste time on that either. No sentence, however, should contain anything with which the class is not yet supposed to be acquainted.

ALPHA.

The forms for the next issue of the BULLETIN will close on January 10. All copy for the February issue should be in the hands of the editors before that date.

